

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,141	11/16/2001	Gregory Robert Roelofs	US018189	4772
7590 07/12/2004				
Corporate Patent Counsel U.S. Philips Corporation 580 White Plains Road Tarrytown, NY 10591			EXAMINER NGUYEN, ANH T	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/991,141

**Applicant(s)**

ROELOFS, GREGORY ROBERT

**Examiner**

Anh T Nguyen

**Art Unit**

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-12, and 21-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7 and 13-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/16/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. By merely describing an element, the claims fail to meet the standard format of claiming convention, which should include matters such as a method with steps, an apparatus or an article of manufacture.

The terms “operably” and “substantial” on lines 4 and 2 of claims 1 and 10 respectively are relative terms and are not defined by the claims, which render the claims indefinite. The specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The usage of these terms is vague and fails to show positive assertiveness.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2174

4. Claims 1,3, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dauerer et al. ("Dauerer", US 5,841,435).

As per claim 1, Dauerer teaches a computer system comprising:

a display buffer that is configured to facilitate a rendering of a display area to a display device (*inherent to a display device for holding the bitmaps of a display to be rendered*), and

a window manager, coupled to the display buffer, having an active area that is larger than the display area, and is configured to facilitate a visual representation of objects in the display area, via a mapping of the display area to locations of the objects in the active area (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 29-38; *active area 52 being larger than the display area 54 with objects such as icons and application windows being represented in the display area*),

wherein the active area is dynamically reconfigurable via a user input (col. 4, lines 41-48; col. 5, lines 32-40; *Defining Virtual Area function*).

As per claims 3, Dauerer teaches the active area to include one or more connected regions that facilitate navigation and access to the objects, via a relocation of the display area relative to the active area (figs. 3 and 8; col. 4, lines 44-48; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 9; *connected regions 56*).

As per claims 8-9, Dauerer teaches access to one or more regions of the connected regions is selectively controlled based on an orientation of the region (figs. 3 and 8; col. 4, lines 44-48; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 9; *connected regions 56*).

As per claim 10, Dauerer teaches the window manager to be configured to provide a representation of a substantially larger portion of the active area to the display

Art Unit: 2174

buffer, to facilitate movement of the display area relative to the active area (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 29-38).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dauerer et al. ("Dauerer", US 5,841,435) in view of Kajiwara (US 5872872).

As per claim 2, Dauerer does not expressly teach the active area to be arbitrarily shaped. However, it is known in the art that an area containing objects for display could be arbitrarily shaped. For instance, Kajiwara discloses areas of display that could be different shapes (Abstract, lines 4-5). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine Kajiwara's teaching with Dauerer's active area in order to provide more dynamics to the active area as well as more flexibility in accommodating display areas and objects therein.

7. Claims 4, 5, 11-12, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dauerer et al. ("Dauerer", US 5,841,435) in view of Bates et al. ("Bates", US 6,204,845 B1).

As per claim 4, Dauerer does not teach the active area to include one or more blocking regions that limit the navigation and access to the objects. Bates teaches a

Art Unit: 2174

method in which navigation and access to objects are limited by blocking regions (col. 2, line 49 – col. 3, line 6; *object handle comprises the bounds or blocking region of an object which limits navigation and access to the object*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the blocking feature of Bates with Dauerer's active area in order to further facilitate window or display area movements (col. 2, lines 57 – col. 3, line 6).

As per claim 5, Dauerer teaches connected regions as passageways (fig. 3; *the grids as shown could be viewed as passageways that could be traveled through in different directions*).

Claims 11-12 are similar in scope to claims 5 and 4 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 21-22, and 24-25, all limitations have been either addressed in claims 1, 3, and 5, are inherent in order for the window manager to function as expected, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 23, Dauerer and Bates do not explicitly disclose the window manager to be configured to provide bit-map image of the display area in a display buffer. However, this function is inherent to a windows management system so that the display process could be functioned properly as expected.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 17-20 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2174

9. Claims 6-7, and 13-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art made of record fails to anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention. Specifically, the prior art fails to teach, in combination with the remaining elements: Modification of the Passageways

### *Conclusion*

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dauerer et al. (US 5,841,435) teaches virtual window desktop

Bates et al. (US 6,204,845) teaches ergonomic viewable object processor

Kajiware (US 5,872,872) teaches image processing system and its method and electronic system having an image processing system.

Ueda (US 5,742,285) teaches virtual screen display system

Brown (US 5,564,002) teaches method and apparatus for implementing a virtual desktop through window positioning

Price (US 5,463,726) teaches method and apparatus for graphic accessing of multiple software applications

Staab (US 5,499,334) teaches method and system for displaying window configuration of inactive programs



Art Unit: 2174

Fagioli (US 6,710,790) teaches methods and apparatus for tracking the active window of a host computer in a remote computer display window

Nakano et al. (US 5,745,109) teaches menu display interface with miniature windows corresponding to each page

*Inquiries*

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 4:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Anh T Nguyen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2174

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100